UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON AT SEATTLE

KIRK WILLIAMS,

Plaintiff,

v.

CYNTHIA SAMPSON and SHORELINE POLICE DEPARTMENT,

Defendants.

CASE NO. C17-0092-JCC

MINUTE ORDER

The following Minute Order is made by direction of the Court, the Honorable John C. Coughenour, United States District Judge:

This matter comes before the Court on Plaintiff Kirk Williams's motion for reconsideration (Dkt. No. 35) of the Court's order (Dkt. No. 33) granting Defendants' motion to dismiss (Dkt. No. 5).

Motions for reconsideration are generally disfavored. W.D. Wash. Local Civ. R. 7(h)(1). Reconsideration is appropriate only where there is "manifest error in the prior ruling or a showing of new facts or legal authority which could not have been brought to [the Court's] attention earlier with reasonable diligence." *Id.* "Motions for reconsideration are not the place for parties to make new arguments or to ask the Court to rethink what it has already thought." *Richard v. Kelsey*, 2009 WL 3762844 at \*1 (W.D. Wash. Nov. 9, 2009).

The Court dismissed all of Williams's claims, finding that the statute of limitations barred his suit. (Dkt. No. 5 at 3.) Williams's motion cites various general authorities as to statutes of limitations. (Dkt. No. 35 at 4.) His only argument is that the Court "must apply Utah's 4 year statute of limitation for personal injury claims." (*See id.* at 5.)

However, for claims under 42 U.S.C. § 1983, the Court applies the forum state's statute of limitations for personal injury actions. *See Wilson v. Garcia*, 471 US 261, 280 (1985). Here, the forum state is Washington. Moreover, the Court already concluded that, even if the statute of limitations was four years, Williams's suit was untimely. (Dkt. No. 33 at 2-3.)

Williams has not shown manifest error in the Court's prior ruling. The motion for reconsideration (Dkt. No. 35) is DENIED.

DATED this 2nd day of May 2017.

William M. McCool Clerk of Court

s/Paula McNabb
Deputy Clerk